SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

RECEIVED
MAY 24 1982
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

RECEIVED
JUN 1 1982
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

No. 82-5204

Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland — Appellant/Plaintiff

against

Registry of Deeds, Salem
Charles Walsh/Richard Greene — Appellees/Defendants

RECEIVED
AUG 6 1982
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME Ct.(Mass),
U.S.D.Ct., U.S.C.A. FOR FIRST CIRCUIT

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland
P.O.Box 1008
Lowell, Mass. 01853

William F Weld
U.S.Atty.office
McCormack P.O.&Courthouse
Boston, Mass 02109

Robert B Stimpson
23 Central Ave
Lynn, Mass. 01901

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Diverso Intuitu.....1

I. Opinion Below 3
II. Parties Litigant 3
III. Jurisdiction.....4
IV. Orders Appealed From 5
V. Statement of the Issues Presented 5
VI. Questions Presented.....7
VII. Statement of the Case 8
VIII. Constitutional Provisions Relied on;
Cases cited which Maintain Jurisdiction.....10
Appendix 15
IX. Argument 16
X. Substantial Reasons.....18
XI. Conclusion 20
XII. Theological Judgment 21
Glossary.....23
Appendix 26

APPENDIX

A- Summons &Complaint, Superior Court.....11/10/81

B. 1/18/82 U.S.D.Ct. Order

C. Demand to Vacate

D. (80-1532-T Order & Disclaimer/Jurisdiction, etc.)

E. (80-1532-T 1/18/82..Contempt denied)

F. 4/2/82 - U.S.C.A.1. Dismissal

G. Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Demand to Vacate

H. 4/21/82 - U.S.C.A.1. Denial of Demand

I. 4/26/82 - Notice of Appeal/Theological Judgment/Disclaimer/ Declaration.

J. U.L.C. & Moon's Church

K. 6/1/81 Affirmation of IRS Default & Averment
8/23/81 Demand under 5 U.S.C. on I.R.S.

L. 6/12/81 Common Law Affidavit Sovereign Citizen/Revoke 1040s/ Demand return all monies/Charge of Criminal Fraud

M. 11/2/81 Demand IRS, etc. prove Jurisdiction. 5 U.S.C.

N. 11/3/81 Notice of Felony to U.S.AttorneyGeneral

O. 11/7/81 2nd Demand to Remove Lien & 2nd Offer
(a valid offer when refused cancels & negates)

P. 11/17/81 Demand IRS prove jurisdiction for criminal actions

Q. 11/24/81 23 years to prove jurisdiction...IRS failed to prove.

R. 12/5/81 Quo Warranto Prerogative Writ of Sovereign Citizen

S I.R.S. Illegal actions affirmed

T. WANTED

CASES CITED

AmJur2d.....14,15
Blackstone 14
Boyd v U.S. 14
Branzeberg v Hayes.....12
Chisholm v Georgia 13
Dartmouth College v Woodward 14
Geofroy v Riggs.....13
Gouled v U.S. 14
Green v U.S. 14
Hill v Philpott.....14
Julliard v Greenman 14
Kansas v Colorado 14
Marbury v Madison.....13,15
Mapp v Ohio 14
Miranda 14
Monongahela Navigation Co v U.S. 15
Olmstead v U.S.....12
Reed v Covert 13
Sherar v Cullen 13
State v Simmons.....15
Taylor v Porter 15
Universal Life Church v U.S.....13
U.S. v Dougherty 14
U.S. v Maylan 14
Williams v Florida.....14

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland — Appellant/Plaintiff

against

Registry of Deeds, Salem
Charles Walsh
Righard Greene — Appellee/Defendant

No. _____

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT
ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME Ct.(Mass),
U.S.D.Ct., U.S.C.A. FOR FIRST CIRCUIT

Superior Court 81-2417
U.S.D.Ct. 81-3017-T
U.S.C.A.1. 82-1241

DIVERSO INTUITU

Appellant, Plaintiff, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, appeals the irresponsible findings of the U.S.D.Ct. and the U.S.C.A.1. after illegally removing from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts an action that is primarily a State-function, in violation of Article 4(4) of the Constitution of the United States, which has never been Constitutionally Amended for the sole purpose of denial of Constitutional Rights of Appellant, at which point the courts lost any and all assumed and alleged jurisdiction/authority (AmJur2d Constitutional Law, Court, Jurisdiction, Jury, Taxpayer Action0; and thus all such orders, findings, mandates, etc. are null and void being illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional; made without permission or consent of the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity (Preamble;Amend.9,10) Minister in violation of Constitutional Rights, established Affidavit and Dishonored Theological Judgment.

This Petition is prepared pro se forma pauperis, as Affidavit of Minister, under Jurisdictional Statement Rule 15 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of the U.S. (rev.12/1/71); and submits this Statement to establish that the Supreme Court of the United States has jurisdiction granted to it by the Rules, and by the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity of Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland.

And that, res judicata, the Constitution of the U.S., or any part thereof is jurisdictional; and that where no standard to petition is made in Constitution, the decision of Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Aimmanity if final and umimpeachable; and that nowhere in the Constitution is granted to any court the right to pick-and-choose what cases it is to hear, and what it is not; for that is making-law in violation of the mandate that only the Legislature can make the laws, under enumeration, of course.

It is admitted as TRUE by the lower courts and the Supreme Court:

That in the early days when a man had a grievance he redressed it himself. During the formation of societies he gave up that right on the theory that when he was grieved the society was grieved and the society redressed it for him. However, when that society refuses to redress his grievance, that society has given back to the man the right to redress it himself...and that society has lost all jurisdiction/authority of that man. (Preamble;Amend.9,10).

Instant case is quite simple. And horrible in its application.

This is a Church-State confrontation, wherein the Appellees violated Amendment 1 Right to Petition; Establishment and Free-Exercise Clauses by placing an illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional LIEN upon Church property, and then refused to remove it.

By refusing to remove the Lien, the Appellees violated more of the Guaranteed and Mandated Constitutional Rights to the point where an Appellee were charged with numerous Criminal actions, and also with Contempt-of-the-Constitution; all of which charges the Appellee Admitted/averred as TRUE; and Admitted Minister Affidavit and Theological Judgment as absolute.

IT IS WRITTEN:

Saul, on the road to Damascus (to persecute more Christians) heard the voice of the Lord Jesus Christ "saying unto him. Saul, Saul, Why persecutest thou me?" Acts 9:4

For it is written that those who persecute the Church of Jesus Christ persecute Jesus Christ himself.

> And those whoso shall receive one little child in my name receiveth me.
> But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck and he were drowned in the depth of the sea.
> Woe unto the world because of offenses! for it must needs be that offenses come; BUT WOE TO THAT MAN BY WHOM THE OFFENCE COMETH! Matt 18:4-7

WOE TO THAT MAN BY WHOM THE OFFENCE COMETH!

That where this is a Christian Nation, this Court must redress the oppressive government practices ignored by the lower courts; and failure, or refusal to do so establishes Minister Affidavit and Theological Judgment as TRUE; and REVOKES "Consent of Governed" Clause of Preamble,Amend.9,10, and Declaration of Independence.

APPEAL

I

OPINION BELOW

October 29, 1982, the IRS, via Appellees filed Lien upon Church property; and when the Registry of Deeds and the IRS refused to remove it, instant case was filed in the Supreme Court, Essex ss, Comm. of Mass. from which U.S.Atty(illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional) illegally removed a State-Action to the U.S.D.Ct.,Boston, before a Judge (formerly U.S.Atty) who dismissed without jury trial; and who was disqualified by Sovereign Citizen for prior Constitutional violations; who had been party in Contempt-of-Court in collusion with U.S.Atty. which they could NOT maintain (for attempting to get redress for oppressive government practices in violation of an alleged court-order not to...and which order suddenly was a nullity) and which admitted to be in Contempt-of-the-Constitution.

Superior Court No. 81-2417
U.S.D.Ct. 81-3017-T
U.S.C.A.1. 82-1241

The United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, in affirmation of the court's prior WRITTEN statement that the Constitution of the U.S. is not valid, binding law (Which Tauro in the U.S.D.Ct., instant case, also denied as being valid), almost by return mail affirmed the violations of the Constitution of the U.S. and dismissed the appeal.

For violation of Constitutional Rights the above courts lost all jurisdiction/authority (if any)(AmJur2d Constitutional Law, Court, Jurisdiction, Jury, Taxpayer Action) of the case. Such findings by illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional Court are void as though never made. For, under defeative Amend.17-Senate, these courts are illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional; and the only jurisdiction that was advanced was by Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity to redress his grievance ONLY. The courts did NOT have jurisdiction/authority to dismiss or deny.

II

Parties Litigant

1. Appellant/Plaintiff, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, is a Citizen of the United States of America; and is Sovereign, with unalienable Sovereign Immunity Rights, as mandated by the Preamble, Amendments 9 and 10 of the U.S.Constitution; and under Sovereign Immunity, no actions can be taken against him without his permission, consent. This the Appellee NEVER had.

2. Appellee/Defendants Registry of Deeds, Salem, illegally registered a Lien upon Church Property and refused to remove that lien. It is a function of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Charles Walsh and Richard Greene are alleged to be "agents" of the I.R.S. Lowell, Mass. who are SERVANTS under the Constitution of the U.S. (which is Contract between government,servant, and

Citizen, Third-party non-signer, as MASTER). However, under defective Amend.17-Senate, the I.R.S. has admitted to being illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional and without jurisdiction/authority to act in any capacity. This Appellees, Walsh and Greene, knew BEFORE the Lien was made on Church Property.

Allegedly being functions of the Executive Branch of government, and without immunities from criminal actions (for the U.S.Con.) does not authorize criminal actions of the government or any part thereof), and without jurisdiction/authority committed clearly defined: Perjury, Felony, Treason, Anarchy, and Outlaw.

Thus, the LIEN placed upon Church Property is Criminal-Action.

III

JURISDICTION

Jurisdiction to redress his grievances is Granted to this Court by the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, and no other jurisdiction/authority.

Further jurisdiction is brought under the Constitution and parts thereof:

Article 3,4,6..Amendments 1,2,4-10,13,14 (any portion of which is jurisdictional)

Magna Carta 1215 A.D.

Body of Liberties 1641 (Comm.of Mass. Magna Carta)

Declaration of Independence (which establishes Sovereignty of Citizen; and provides that NO government has jurisdiction/authority without "consent of governed"; and, this being REPUBLIC, "consent" is of INDIVIDUAL...not majority).

Common Law Public-Wrong provisions wherein when government is a litigant proceedings are CRIMINAL, and all Proceedures and Safeguards apply, including Burden-of-Proof. Anything less is government-lynching; and "case-law" is judicial making-law in violation of Constitution (Legislature).

Federal Rules of Civil Proceedure Rule 8, 12(b)(6) wherein all that is not answered or denied <u>completely</u> is Admitted and Admitted/averred as TRUE....for all time!

Thus Citizen demand for proof of jurisdiction/authority when not proven constitutes gov't FELONY (Olmstead v U.S.)

Allegedly:

26 U.S.C. 1443, 7206,13,14,17,7344,7804(b)
28 U.S.C. 1346
42 U.S.C. 1983,1985,1986,1988

(However, statutes since 1915 are under suspicion:Amend.17-Senate!)

Article X (Const.Mass) which mandates that when the government fails to protect, Sovereign Citizen is not required to pay; and Common Law (Christian) the gov't ceases to have jurisdiction/authority.

And, whatsoever is not listed herein is not waived by omission both Above, and Below.

IV

ORDERS APPEALED FROM

U.S.D.Ct. 81-3017-T Dismissal January 18, 1982
U.S.C.A.1. 82-1241 Dismissal April 2, 1982
U.S.C.A.1. 82-1241 Denial of demand to vacate order of 4/2/82
April 21, 1982

V

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES PRESENTED

This Nation has a Constitution. Christian.

However, this Nation does not have a Constitutional government. The exact date of unconstitutionality undetermined. Conservatives estimate approx. 1908 (Taft from Territory of Ohio); others maintain approx 1860-61. Anti-Christ.

A Sovereign Citizen can be a Citizen under the Constitution; and maintain Sovereign Immunity against unConstitutional government.

1. That where Tauro, alleged judge, violated his Article 6 oath to uphold the Constitution as the Supreme Law, and denied that it is valid, he lost any and all jurisdiction/authority he may or may not have had; and, under Amend.17-Senate he is illegal, unlawfull, unConstitution. Thus is acting in Felony, Anarchy, Outlaw.

2. The Department of Justice, allegedly representing the Appellees Admitted and Admitted/averred as TRUE (for all time) that it is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional under defective Amend.17-Senate; and failed to establish jurisdiction/authority to act; and having acted in false/fraudulent charge of Contempt-of-Court; is thus acting in Felony, Anarchy, Outlaw.

None of the "pleadings" thus filed by the U.S.Attorney are valid, and thus have no merit nor weight.

3. Yet, Tauro, refused to get off case for prior and instant violations of Constitutional Rights; and also refused to disallow U.S.Attorney "pleadings"...even though agreeing that the U.S.Atty. is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional, and has no jurisdiction/authority to proceed.

4. It was Admitted and Admitted/averred as TRUE that the Lien was fraud; that Lien was improperly put on Church-Property in violation of Amendment 1, etc.; and that no repersentative had authority/jurisdiction to take such action.

5. The claim that the I.R.S. et al, agents thereof, etc., are not a sueable-entity is totally FALSE. Nowhere in the Constitution is granted immunity to the criminal SERVANT. In fact, Appellees have failed to prove jurisdiction/authority for legal or <u>illegal</u> actions when such proof was demanded; and are in default as per Title 5 U.S.C. which mandates prompt and total answer.

6. Demand for DEFAULT JUDGMENT was made, as warned on the Summons for (a) failure to timely (or otherwise) Answer; (b) Amendment 1 Right to Redress, as Constitution and Supreme Law takes precedence over any statutory motions or provisions...since 1915 under Amend.17-Senate. The court (Tauro) refused to consider the Constitution, thus ruled on quicksand statutes, rules, regulations.

7. Under F.R.C.P. Rule 12(b)(6) "fails to state a claim", the Appellees have further admitted/averred all facts (ancient demurrer) and the interwoven-law, as TRUE. That which is once admitted remains admitted for all time in all litigations. Thus, having admitted to grievance, as a Constitutional issue, Tauro had no jurisdiction/authority to dismiss. In doing so, he further denied that the Constitution is valid, binding law.

8. Any claim that the court lacks subject matter jurisdiction is, of course, PERJURY. The subject matter of the petition concerns violations of the Constitution of the U.S. Such denial, of course, violates the Art.6 oath/affirmation to uphold the Constitution as the Supreme Law...to "uphold" is to ENFORCE..not interpret mischeviously.

9. The contention of Appellees and Tauro that the U.S. has Sovereign Immunity is further perjury. The Preamble, Amend.9,10 establish that the government is SERVANT, and in Contract with the Sovereign Citizen, MASTER, Third-party non-signer, as the SERVANT of that Citizen.

The Servant can not exceed the Master. Nor can that Servant have immunities without the express WRITTEN permission/consent of the Master. This is, of course, denied. No such permission/consent in this Republic has been granted.

10. The claim that Statutes; 26 U.S.C. and 28 U.S.C. bar action of instant case are illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional (under defective Amend.17-Senate); and, being unconstitutional, violate multiple Constitutional mandates; Preamble, Art.3,4,6, Amend.1,4-10, 13,14, Common Law (Christian not former king's self-serving courts) etc.etc.etc. and are unconstitutional on their face and in their application.

This charge has been made before, and, where Burden-of-Proof is upon government in all such challenges, it has been admitted that 26 U.S.C. and 28 U.S.C. are UNCONSTITUTIONAL.

11. All pleadings of Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland as Minister are witness, evidence, and Affidavit; andTheological Judgment which must, by Body-of-Liberties 1641, be Honored in the Courts. To dismiss...is to DISHONOR.

12. In refusing to requesse, get off case, Tauro established conspiracy/collusion to deny and deprive of Constitutional Rights; and by subvert and overt "legalisms" attempted to limit by court-enumeration, the Unenumerated Rights of Amend.9, Reserved Rights of Amend.10; and denied demanded Jury Trial. This Tauro, and

all branches of the government, are forbidden and prohibited from victimizing the Sovereign Citizen.

13. Actions by Appellees is ATTAINDER, and Bill-of-Attainder under color-of-law in that it injures Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, and denies Constitutional Rights, including Redress..and attacking a Christian Church.

All branches of government: Executive, Legislative, Judiciary lose jurisdiction/authority for violation Constitutional Rights (U.S.Const. U.S.S.Ct. res judicata). Thus, in taking improper actions, for which there was no Constitutional Redress (74AmJur2d Taxpayer Actions Sec.10-14) such action taken by Appellees was invalidated by the Constitution, and established FRAUD (which Appellees admitted); and that all documents filed are false and fraudulent.

14. When Charge of FRAUD and/or lack of jurisdiction/authority is made, neither the executive, legislative, nor judiciary can proceed until such charges are disproven. They were NOT disproven; in fact, admitted and admitted/averred as TRUE.

15. No branch of government has the jurisdiction/authority to ATTACK, by any means, a lawful, legal, Constitutional Christian Church held Allodial Freehold by SEVERAL persons...with a VALID I.R.S. religious exemption number.

This was also admitted and admitted/averred as TRUE.

VI

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Can any court,or judge, proceed when the charge of FRAUD and lack of jurisdiction/authority is made...and admitted/averred that such charge is TRUE?

(The U.S.Const., U.S.S.Ct., AmJur2d state it cannot)

2. Can the federal government (suspected illegal under Amend.17-Senate) enter into a state action without permission/consent?

(Article 4:4 states it cannot; Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant has not granted permission nor given consent)

3. Can any court, or judge, proceed when it is <u>proven</u> that he has and continues to violate Guaranteed and Mandated Constitutional Rights?

(U.S.Const., U.S.S.Ct. AmJur2d state it cannot, res judicata)

4. Can any court, or judge, or branch of government, deny Redress and retain jurisdiction/authority of Sovereign Citizen without his express permission/consent?

(Preamble, Amend.9,10; Declaration of Independence; Art.X Const.Mass; U.S.S.Ct., etc. state it cannot, res judicata)

5. Where does any branch of government get jurisdiction/authority to violate CONTRACT (U.S.Constitution) with, or without, impunity?

(U.S.Const., U.S.S.Ct.,AmJur2d state it cannot, res judicata)

6. Can a court, or judge, proceed and ignore the charge of UNCONSTITUTIONALITY?

(U.S.Const.,U.S.S.Ct. AmJur2d states it cannot, res judicata)

7. Can any branch of government proceed after admitting that Amendment 16 is Unconstitutional (multiple, res judicata); and proceed to apply alleged "statutes" founded upon unconstitutional Amendment 16?

(U.S.S.Ct. states it cannot, res judicata)

8. Can the government, or any part thereof, maintain the claim of "immunity"?

(The Preamble, Amend.9,10; Dec.Independence; U.S.S.Ct. state clearly that the government is NOT Sovereign...thus cannot claim Sovereign Immunity. Anything to the contrary (including Marshall's 1821 "finding")is the Perjury of rogues scoundrels, assorted tyrants).(Even under God's Law of Liberty & Justice, with Free Will, there is accountability. It may be delayed, at times, but is inevitable and certain).

9. Can any portion of government, attack, damage, violate the Amendment 1 ESTABLISHMENT and FREE EXERCISE of religion clauses?

(U.S.Const., U.S.S.Ct., AmJur2d states it cannot)res judicata)

VII

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

After Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, won his case (jury) 72-3269-M, wherein the IRS admitted Amendment 16 is unconstitutional, and that the federal reserve note is not lawful, Constitutional money, the IRS intensified criminal harassment against Appellant.

October 29, 1981, Appellees filed LIEN upon Christian Church. Appellees ADMITTED this Lien is FRAUD, improperly filed, filed with malice under "color-of-law", violates Amendment 1 Rights (Religion, etc.); that appellees had no jurisdiction/authority, for the I.R.S. is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional (for both: violation Constitutional Rights; and under defective Amend.17-Senate)

Appellees refused to remove the Lien; and later refused offers of settlement (without admitting jurisd. under Art.X.Mass) thus establishing the Lien as illegal, and if legal that under Common Law when valid offer is rejected all claims are cancelled. So Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland brought suit to Remove Lien and for damages, in their INDIVIDUAL capacities. When the government elected to defend, it became government-crime (Brandeis:Olmstead v US)

The U.S.Attorney moved to have the case removed from the State court and promptly moved to dismiss. At a hearing, he, and hisIbuddy, "judge" Tauro admitted to being illegal, unlawful, un Constitutional; and totally without jurisdiction/authority. Then, denying fair trial, jury trial, Proceedural Safeguards under Common Law Public-Wrong, etc.etc. Tauro dismissed the case; thus acting in collusion to violate Amendment 1 ESTABLISHMENT and FREE EXERCISE

of religion Clauses. When Tauro denied the motions filed by Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, he denied that the Constitution is valid, binding law.

Appeal brief filed in the U.S.Court of Appeals for the First Circuit was never answered nor denied. On that basis alone, it is admitted as TRUE; and where the question of violation of the Constitution was paramount, the court had no jurisdiction/authority granted to dismiss..without hearing, without jury trial demanded. Thus, with the U.S.C.A.1. also violating Constitutional Rights, that court lost alleged jurisdiction/authority.

Thus, Disclaimer of Jurisdictinn/authority is filed with each Court, together with Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Declaration of Outlaw for Criminal denials of Constitutional Rights, and using tortuous "legalisms" to substantiate the unwritten War upon the Sovereign Citizen by government that has refused its only legitimate function: to protect the Sovereign Citizen from oppressive government practices.

Admitted and Admitted/Averred as TRUE:

Tauro is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional
U.S.C.A.1. is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional (a short time prior had issued WRITTEN order that the Constitution of the U.S. is not valid, binding law).
U.S.Attorney, Dept. Justice, is illegal, unlawful, unConst.
I.R.S. is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional
Appellee in filing LIEN and refusing to remove it are acting in Perjury, Felony, Treason, Anarchy, Outlaw

AND

The Department of Justice has refused to act on Notice-of-Felony filed by Sovereign Citizen.
The LIEN upon Church is FRAUD, false and fraudulent document.

That the government, Appellees, etc. has Failed-to-Protect as mandated by Amendment 4. This is Breach of Contract with the Sovereign Citizen; Breach of Covenant with GOD; and Breach of FAITH with both GOD and the Sovereign Citizen. Matt. 18:15-17

It is a long established fact, res judicata, under Constitution, Common Law, U.S.S.Ct. findings that no party can sit in judgment of its own interests. The courts being of-the-government, and being directly involved could NOT sit in judgment of government-issue when Common Law Jury Trial per pais peers (by the gountry, not the governm.nt) is DEMANDED. Thus, any such actions are null and void; and finding, orders, etc. are unConstitutional Denial of Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity RIGHTS.

For, under Defective Amendment-17 Senate, the court has no jurisdiction/authority of any case without Common Law Jury Trial per pais peers of Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Jurors.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, filed with the U.S.D.Ct. OATH OF PURGATION charging Appellees with their numerous crimes; and wherein all claims, charges, etc. against Appellant are washed away and forgiven; and that no-man can challenge the forgiveness of GOD. This has been established, res judicata, in several courts.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, also filed Writ of

Habeas Corpus to releas the Body of the Church...which the court refused to hear.

And, Sovereign Citizen, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, filed SOVEREIGN CITIZEN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE, the total declaration to which has been incorporated the evils and corruptions updated to present; as per provisions of Watergate and Nuremberg; and which is valid under Preamble, Amendments 9,10, etc. This, too, the court refused to hear.

Thus, there is no way, the lower courts can establish jurisdiction/authority or that any findings of the courts are valid, for, those making such findings, under defective Amend.17-Senate, are, themselves, illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional...politicians.. not judges. For a JUDGE is Minister FOR God's Law of Liberty & Justice. None has been exhibited.

VIII

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS RELIED ON & CASES CITED WHICH MAINTAIN JURISDICTION

26 U.S.C. 7421 (Anti-Injunction Act), and 28 U.S.C. 2201 (Declaratory Judgment Act) are both unconstitutional on their face and in their application.

And, under Constitution, Common Law Public-Wrong, the Burden-of-Proof remains upon the government. (U.S.S.Ct. AmJur2d Const. Law, res judicata). (a) admitted unconstitutional; &(b) having been passed after 1915 under defective Amend.17-Senate.

Thus, where Appellees, defended by the government, having failed to prove, the unconstitutionality remains prima facie evidence.

Constitutional Violations:

A. Article 3. Denies access to courts in cases at law & equity. Denies mandated jury trial (Common Law Public-Wrong)

B. Article 4. Denies equal privileges and immunities; establishes false and fraudulent "Sovereign Immunity" of the SERVANT: The I.R.S., etc.

C. Denies Republican form of govennment by establishing bureaucratic Tyranny mandates that are alleged to be of more authority than the courts.

C. Article 6. Denies the Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land; and by subornation corrupts judges etc. to braak their Art.6 oath/affirmation.

D. Amendment 1. Violates ESTABLISHMENT, FREE EXERCISE clauses Denies Freedom of Speach; Denies Right to petition the government for redress of grievance (especially where the government is the SOURCE of the grievances); Invades and a abuses the RIGHT TO BE LET ALONE.

E. Amendment 2. Denies the RIGHT to protect self and property by fiat and "color-of-law"

F. Amendment 4. Fails-to-Protect, in denying security of persons,

houses, papers and effects..without Due Process!!! and especially violates the honorable Allodial Freehold.

G. Amendment 5. Denies fair trial, jury trial under Due Process Seizes without just compensation; compells witness-against-self, etc.

H. Amendment 6. Denies fair, public, speedy trial by impartial jury; denies assistance of counsel; denies Proceedural Safeguards, etc.

I. Amendment 7. Denies Common Law Jury Trial per pais peers.

J. Amendment 8. Establishes excessive cruel and unusual punishments without redress.

K. Amendment 9. Denies Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity (Preamble & A.10); and all other unenumerated RIGHTS on the fraudulent "legalism" basis that if it is not spelled out it is invalid, illegal...to the Citizen Protection.

L. Amendment 10. Denies the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity and many, many other Reserved RIGHTS; and assumes, usurps and abuses powers not granted. (see Amend.9)

M. Amendment 13. Attempts to subordinate Sovereign Citizen into class of involuntary servitude & peonage, without proper conviction of any crimes; and without jurisdiction/authority of any legal court.

N. Amendment 14. Attempts to convert Citizenship into a privilege-grant by government instead of mandated Sovereign Immunity RIGHT that is res judicata; Denies Due Process, Equal Protection, Privileges, Immunities.

O. Amendment 16, 17: Upon which Title 26 & 28 are based, was never issued by Constitutional 2/3rds of Congress, never ratified by 3/4ths of the legal states; and IMPROPERLY "signed" into law.
Thus, both being unconstitutional 1913,1914,1915, enforcemend directly or by "color-of-law" statutes is FRAUD.

P. Federal Reserve Act of 1913...illegally, unlawfully, unConstitutionally changes the Constitutional Monetary System by STATUEE (Amend.17-Senate Statute) and not by Amendment to Constitution as is mandated...and which cannot NOW be done under Defective Amendment-17-Senate.

Q. God's Law of Liberty & Justice. This nation is established as a Christian Nation, and was Dedicated to GOD numerous times from the Shipboard Covenant, 1636. The Common Law is the Christian Common Law founded upon the Testaments. Such statutes as violate the honor, honesty, decency, morality establish FRAUD by usurping the functions of the Christian Church illegally, unlawfully, unConstitutionally in violation Amend.1, and establishes Humanism as government-Church.

Therefore, such statutes establish FRAUD, prevent redress to the Sovereign, the Citizen; allow unrestrained and evil harassment

and persecution under "color-of-law", with extreme bias & malice. This not only establishes Denial-of-Justice..but also Denial of ACCESS-to-Justice; Fraudulent "protections" are a prime instigator and mover to corruptions in government. Protection of improper motives and influences, plain disregard of duty, gross abuse of power, or discretion, etc. become the casualties; Due Process and Accountability for gov't actions. The FOUNDERS warned of such usurpations and corruptions; and built Safeguards into the Constitution...which, by mutual consent of the government, hade been eroded away.

As Justice Douglas stated so clearly and bluntly, in his dissent in Branzeberg v Hayes, 408 U.S. 665(1972):

> For the understanding of these principles it is essential to keep clear the crucial diffence between 'the rights' of the governed and 'the powers' of the governors. And at this point, the title 'Bill of Rights' is lamentably inaccurate as a designation of the first ten amendments. They are not a 'Bill of Rights' but a 'Bill of Powers and Rights'. The Second through Ninth Amendments limit the powers of the subordinate agencies in order that due regard shall be paid to the private 'rights of the governed'. The First and Tenth Amendments protect the governing 'powers' of the people from abridgment by the agencies which are established as their servants. In the field of our 'rights', each one of us can claim 'due process of law'. In the field of our governing 'powers', the notion of 'due process' is irrelevant.

And, also, in Olmstead v U.S. 277 U.S. 438 (1928) Justice Brandeis dissented and WARNED in clear, sharp language:

> When these unlawful acts were committed they were crimes only to the officers individually. The government was innocent, in legal contemplation; for no federal official is authorized to commit a crime on its behalf. When the government, having full knowledge, sought, through the Department of Justice, to avail itself of the fruits of these acts in order to accomplish its own ends, it assumed moral responsibility for the officers' crimes... And if this court should permit the government, by means of its officers' crimes, to effect its purpose of punishing the defendants, there would seem to be present all the elements of a ratification. If so, the government itself would become a lawbreaker.
> .....Decency, security, and liberty alike demand that government officials shall be subjected to the same rules of conduct that are commands to the citizen. In a government of laws, existence of the government will be imperiled if it fails to observe the law scrupulously. Our government is the potent, the omnipresent teacher. For good or for ill, it teaches the whole peiple by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy. To declare that in the administration of the criminal law the end justifies the means--to declare that the government may commit crimes in order to secure th conviction of a private criminal--would bring terrible retribution.
> Against that pernicious doctrine this court should resolutely set its face.

Under the Common Law Public-Wrong: whenever government is one of the litigants, regardless of alleged "civil" label on the case, the case is totally CRIMINAL; and ALL Proceedural Safeguards Apply.

So, the warnings of Olmstead apply, and remain a warning to

government as to their actions..and the results thereof. For, such actions violate the mandated provision that this nation is a REPUBLIC; and, having betrayed the governed, the governmd are thus granted the unsurrendered RIGHT to REVOKE that consent. (Preamble, Amend.9,10, Declaration of Independence).

And, for the Courts, including Tauro, to sanction and to approve of criminal actions of "officers" and branches of the government is to put the official government stamp of approval upon CRIME.

This Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev. Dr.Edward Wayland, has not agreed to;and is forbidden by his Lord GOD to honor or to glorify...for such actions are of satan..not of GOD.

Civil No.S-1954 Universl Life Church Inc. v U.S.A.

> Neither this Court, nor any branch of this Government, will consider the merits or fallacies of a religion. Nor will the Court compare the beliefs, dogmas, and practices of a newly organized religion with those of an older, more established religion. Nor will the Court praise or condemn a religion, however excellent or fanatical or preposterous it may seem. Were the Court to do so, it would impinge upon the guarantees of the First Amendment.
>
> In short, the Court merely finds that the plaintiff's ordination of ministers, its granting of church charters, and its issuance of Honorary Doctor of Divinity certificates are not substantial activities which do not further any religious purpose. Furthermore, the facts outlined supra reveal that the plaintiff requested, but did not require, free will offerings in performande of these activities.
>
> IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff be and is entitled to a Federal Tax Exemption and to a refund of all moneys levied against by the defendant with interest thereon from the date of levy, March 19, 1970
>
> IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that defendant's counterclaim be and is dismissed and the plaintiff is entitled to recover the reasonable costs of the suit herein
>
> IT IS ALSO ORDERED that the plaintiff submit an appropriate judgment in accordance herewith.
>
> Done and dated this 27th day of February, 1974
>
> James F Battis..U.S.D.Ct.Judge

Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr. Edward Wayland, was ordained as Minister by God January 6, 1936 at Market St. Philadelphia, Pa. (and man: both church & school at a later date). The Church property LIENED by Appellees is accredited by Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a CHURCH, which accredition must be honored by the U.S.A. as per Constitution Art.3-6; and has valid I.R.S.exemption number: DO94E1N94-1599591

The, all Appellees knew and were aware of.

> One of the great objects of government is to protect the life,liberty, and property of the individual citizen.
> Chisholm v Georgia (16AmJur2d.Constit. law. Sect.328+)
>
> The U.S. is entirely a creature of the Constitution...
> Marbury v Madison 1 Cranch 137(1803)
> Reed v Covert 354 US 1,17
> Geofrey v Riggs 133 US 258,267
> etc.etc.res judicata
>
> There can be no sanction or penalty imposed upon one because of his exercise of Constitutional Rights.
> Sherar v Cullen 481 F2d 496

Ordinarily it is sound policy to adhere to prior decisions, but this practice has quite properly never been a blind inflexible rule.
Green v U.S. 356 US 165
(for only litigants of a case are bound by that decision...if the court has violated no Const.rights)

Only the findings of Common Law Jury trial per pais peers with right to determine facts and law (Georgia v Brailsford, Dall 1 (1794) aan be cited; got anything else is Judiciary "making-law".

Denial of Jury Trial is Denial of Due Process
16AmJur2d Constitutional Law: S.20,21,548-550+
47AmJur2d JURY: S.20,21,47+,52,53,83,etc.
The view has been taken that a court sitting without a jury, where there is a right to a jury trial which has not been waived, has no juridiction of the case. (S.20)

And that where a jury found the law was contrary they had the right to so decide.
U.S. v Dougherty 473 F2d 1113,1130
U.S. v Maylan 417 F2d 1002...etc.etc.

The jury trial is a RIGHT
Kansas v Colorado 206 US 46
Julliard v Greenman 110 US 421
Hill v Philpott 445 F2d 144...etc.etc.

Where rights secured by the Constitution are involved there can be no rule making or legislation which would abrogate them.
Ch.J.Earl Warren in Miranda

(Denied Jury Trial establishes tyranny)
Jury is a safeguard against arbitrary law enforcement
Williams v Florida 90 S.Ct. 1893,1905

No arbitrary and unlimited power is vested in any department; such power is regarded as a condition subversive of the Constitution, and the chief characteristic and evil of tyrannical and despotic forms of government.
16AmJur2d sect.212

In numerous cases the courts have held tha property which is not the fruit or instrumentalities of a crime, or contraband, is not subject to seizure
Gouled v U.S. 255 US 298
Boyd v U.S. 116 US 616,630
Mapp v Ohio 367 US 643...etc.etc.etc.

A LIEN is a seizure. The Appellees, in addition, have failed to prove the CHURCH is a Crime or a Contraband, etc. In fact, the citations above prove and establish absolute ownership of Allodial Freehold, which is provision of CHURCH.

"...to bereave a man of life, or by violence to confiscate his estate, without accusation or trial would be so gross and notorious an act of despotism, as must at once convey the alarm of tyranny through the whole kingdom.
Blackstone, Commentaries Bk 1, Ch.1.pg 135

The LIEN is improper, illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional, and has never been authorized or issued by Constitutional Court or judge that had proven jurisdiction/authority to do so. This is Admitted and Admitted/averred as TRUE by Appellees.

Bythe law of the land is most clearly intended the general law; a law which proceeds upon inquiry, and renders judgment after trial. The meaning is that every citizen shall hold his life, liberty, property, and immunities, under the protection of the general laws which govern society. Everything which may pass under the form of an enactment, is not, therefore, to be considered the law of the land.
Dartmouth College v Woodward 4 Wheat 518,581(1819)

(The Fourteenth Amendment)was intended to protect those rights of persons and property which by the Declaration of Independence were affirmed to be inalienable rights
Monongahela Navigation Co v US 148 US 312,324(1892)

The term "due process of law" as used in the Federal Constitution has been repeatedly declared to be the exact equivalent of the "law of the land" as used in the Magna Carta...
16AmJur2d Sec.546+

And, the Magna Carta was based on, founded upon the Old and New Testaments: an interpretation of the Word of GOD.

Law of the Land means the common law...
State v Simmons 2 Spears 761,767(1884)
Taylor v Porter 4 Hill 140,146(1843)...etc.etc.

The very essence of civil liberty certainly consists in the right of every individual to claim the protection of the laws whenever he receives an injury
Marbury v Madison 1 Cranch 137

This, the lower courts, the various branches of government denied and claimed fictional immunities which they could NOT prove nor substantiate; thus admitted to Felony and Treason.

A party's affidavit disqualifying the judge, who has (or has not) jurisdiction over a case, if the disqualification is valid, deprives the judge of further authority to act in the case.
20 AmJur2d Sec.150

It is established, res judicata, that the Minister pleadings are the equivalent of 2-3, or more witnesses; thus the pleadings are AFFIDAVIT. Also, under Defective Amend.17-Senate, judge has no legal, lawful, Constitutional jurisdiction/authority to act or to proceed. Thus, Tauro, and the judges of the U.S.C.A.1. proceeded in Felony and Treason.

A failure to perform a promise (Breach of Contract, Breach of Covenant, Breach of Faith) the performance of which is a condition precedent, is an excuse for non-performance of the promise made by the other party.
17AmJur2d Contracts Sec.398; Art.X Const.Mass; Amendment 4 U.S.Const. FAILS TO PROTECT

The general rule is that an unconstitutional statute, though having the form and name of law, is in reality no law, but is wholly void and ineffective for any purpose, since unconstitutionality dates from the time of its enactment, and not merely from the date of the decision so branding it...No one is bound to obey an unconstitutional law and no courts are bound to enforce it
16 AmJur2d Sec.177

In order for a statute to be legal, lawful, Constitutional it must pass Congress as prescribed by the Articles governing; must be passed by legal state representatives and senators, and signed into law by those Constitutionally allowed to do so. However, under Defective Amendment 17-Senate, since 1915, an illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional Senate cannot act on any "laws".

Appendix:
A-I establishes that the lower courts had no jurisdiction/authority. And, also, by F.R.C.P Rules 8 & 12(b)(6); Constitution Preamble, Amends 9,10, Common Law, etc. in having failed to answer or to deny completely, Appellees have Admitted and Admitted/averred as TRUE the Complaint AND subsequent pleadings (Complaint encl)

J: Establishes that the lower courts have approved violation Amendment 1 ESTABLISHMENT and FREE EXERCISE clauses

K+S: Proves I.R.S. and thus Appellees, is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional; has failed to prove jurisdiction/authority; and, in refusing valid-offer, under Common Law, etc. has rescinded and vacated any and all claims, real or fictitious. U.S.S.Ct etc. res judicata.

T: WANTED: the ultimate tragedy

IX

ARGUMENT

The final arbiter of controversies wherein the government is self-serving in its own interests on government-issue is by Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity as exemplified by the Common Law Jury Trial per pais peers..a determination by the country..not by government.

For the government to determine on "government-issue" violates both the Constitution and the Common Law (Christian), for the government is then acting in its own self-serving interests; and, by law, the government cannot be a party-to, and in judgment-of its own issue and interests.

HOWEVER, where Amendment 1 establishes ABSOLUTE Church Rights then neither the government, the courts, nor the Common Law Jury determine to violate theim.

Instant case is grievance by Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland for violations of that absolute Amendment 1 mandate.

What could be more clear cut?

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, demanded Tauro requesse, and disqualified him; but self-serving Tauro refused. Even when informed he had no jurisdiction/authority and was illegal, unlawful unConstitutional under Amend.17-Senate, Tauro ignored the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity mandate.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, also charged that under defective Amend.17-Senate, the Dept. Justice wias illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional and lacked jurisdiction/authority to represent, defend, or to prosecute in instant case; and that repeated charges had not been answered/denied, thus admitted/averred as TRUE. That in so acting, and in failure to protedt (Notice of Felony), was acting illegaly, and had ratified and assumed criminality of Appellees

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, under the provisions of Title 5 U.S.C. demanded from all in case proof of jurisdiction/authority for actions and for filing illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional LIEN upon Christian Church.

ALL failed to answer or deny; and thus admitted/averred the charges made.

Without jurisdiction/authority; the lower courts established the status of Kangaroo-Court; the judges of U.S.D.Ct. and U.S.C.A.1 are without jurisdiction; an illegal Department of Justice; and

established further violation of mandated Constitutional Rights of Appellant, among which are:

Fair Trial
Jury Trial before unbiased..lawful..judge
Proceedural Safeguards of Common Law Public-Wrong
Equal Protection, Privileges, Immunities
etc.etc.etc.etc.
Refusal to remove LIEN from Christian Church established collusion/conspiracy; violated guaranteed Religious Rights; and in so doing became FAIL TO PROTECT, Breach of Contract, Breach of Covenant, Breach of Faith

Such violations, of course,are not allowed in a REPUBLIC. Such are the acts of despotism and tyranny. Such acts establish no claim upon Appellant for they have no jurisdiction/authority. Such acts destroy any "claims" of Appellees and thus void the alleged "validity" of the LIEN on Church, which is in controversy and the source of this Grievance.

Refusal of the government to Redress Grievance thereby1 REVOKES the CONSENT OF THE GOVERNED. Refusal grants to the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, the unqualified RIGHT to redress the grievance himself. This is so affirmed in Matt 18:15-17.

Amendment 17 came out of congress quite a few votes short of the required 2/3ds (House of Representatives; Senate) and was illegally ratified by 3/4ths of the States...several of which, even at this date, are illegal, never having been properly admitted into the Union. Thus, it was improperly signed into law. And, a Senate elected under illegal Amend.17 is, of courlse, also illegal.

On that basis along, Tauro had no jurisdiction/authority;nor did Appellees have authority to file LIEN and refuse to remove it.

That only Common Law Jury Trial per pais peers is legal, lawful, Constitutional in the courtroom.

This, of course, was denied to Appellant.

Thus, not only is 26 U.S.C. and 28 U.S.C. unconstitutional, as above reasons, bht they are also unconstitutional on their face and in their application (Admitted/averred by Appellees) as it violates the Constitution, and the Rights mandated and guaranteed to the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity.

Thus, to act on unconstitutional STATUTE is a deliberate act of TREASON. The lower courts have been charged with (a)Contempt of the Constitution (b)Treason (c)etc.

Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr. Edward Wayland herein demands this Court ABIDE by the provisions of Amend.1 ESTABLISHMENT and FREE EXERCISE clauses, etc.; or, in the alternative furnish, in lawful manner, Common Law Jury Trial per pais peers by 12 Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Jurors.

And that trial to be made without interference or harassment from Amend.17-Senate judge.

APPEAL

X

SUBSTANTIAL REASONS

The denial of Constitutional Rights is Tyranny

The attack upon the Christian Church is attack upon GOD

William Penn, in 1681, stated bluntly that either the nation is governed by God or ruled by tyrants. It is a sad truth that no tyrant recognizes his own tyranny. By 1775 standards, this Nation has long since surpassed, out-done, and out-stripped the tyranny of George III...and, ironically, those responsible do not recognize that it is Tyranny.

Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr. Edward Wayland, has the Guaranteed Amendment Right to Petition the Government for Redress of Grievances, the Right to Speak, Right to demanded Jury Trial, Right to Freedom of Religion, etc.etc.

This is amblified by the Common Law (Christian not former king's self-serving courts), which are brought into instant case by Common Law Amendments 9 and 10 unenumerated and reserved Rights. And by Amendment 14 Declaration of Independence Unalienable Rights. Thus, under the Common Law and Constitution, Appellant has the Absolute, Unalienable Right to Common Law Jury Trial per pais peers.

And that under the Common Law all government-citizen litigation regardless of "civil" labels, is Public-Wrong (Criminal). Thus, Appellant has the Absolute Unalienable Right to Due Process, Fair Trial, Impartial Judge, Proceedural Safeguards, Jury Trial, etc.etc.

NO government-citizen litigation can Constitutionally be termed EQUITY!!!

The mandate of Amendment 7 is that decisions by a Common Law Jury cannot be reexamined (or challenged except under rules of Common Law..not the whim of frightened or intimidated judges) on that particular case only. This establishes that the Common Law Juryl verdict is <u>superior</u> to that of the U.S.S.Ct., being 12 Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Jurors. Thus, any non-jury decision is not valid, and can NOT be judicially cited for any reason or purpose, fur such pampose is, of course, <u>improper</u>. And NO Sovereign Citizen can be bound by judge-made-law.

NONE of the alleged "citations" by Appellees are valid.

Nothing is more essential to the preservation of the Rule of Law than the preservation of those Rights and Immunities reserved to the <u>Individual</u>, Sovereign Citizen by the Preamble, Bill-of-Powers-and-Rights of the Contract: the Constitution of the United States. These Rights and Immunities are of inestimable value. These Rights and Immunities are absolute and inalienable. These Rights and Immunities constitute a fortress against the onslought of tyrants, rogues and scoundrels.

And, the most important of these Rights is the RIGHT to

Jury Trial, which must be Common Law per pais peers on all government-issues. For, but such Jury, the Sovereign Citizen determines how he is to be governed...and which "laws" he decides is government usurpation. It is only by such safeguards can the consent of the Sovereign Citizen be assured.

Not otherwise.

And it is established, res judicata, that when the government denies, deprives, or violates any Constitutional Right of the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity, the government, division, branch, department completely and unutterably loses ALL jurisdiction and authority of the case and of the individual. This is established both by the Constitution and by God's Law of Liberty & Justice.

This, being declared a CHRISTIAN nation, no part of the government has the jurisdiction/authority to attack a CHRISTIAN Church. For GOD does not attack HIS own Church. This is further mandated by the provisions of Amendment 1.

This, Appellees have violated. In attacking a Christian Church, they have declared themselfs to be Anti-Christ...which cannot be sustained in a CHRISTIAN NATION.

> Woe unto them that decreee unrighteous decrees and that write grievousness which they have prescribed.
> To turn aside the needy from judgment and to take away from the poor of MY people that widows may be their prey and thatthey rob the fatherless.
> And what will ye do in that day of visitation and in the desolation which shall come from far to whom will ye flee for help and where will ye leave ~~KMM~~your glory
> Without ME they shall bow down under the prisoners and they shall fall under the slain. For all this HIS anger is not turned away but HIS hand is stretched out still. Isaiah 10:1-4
>
> Woe unto you scribes and pharisees...
> Woe unto you lawyers...
>
> Woe unto...is God's Condemnation and Judgment
>
> And if HE send HIS Wrath upon you, and upon your deeds, you are not they who can supplicate HIM; for you utter against HIS Righteousness great and powerful things.
> To you there shall be no peace. Enoch 100:3

The Constitution is the guardian of the Covenant Way of life in the United States. It is Covenant. Breach of the Constitution is Breach of Contract, Breach of Covenant, Breach of Faith, for the government has failed to protect the Sovereign Citizen and the Christian Church

which is its ONLY legitimate function.

This nation is now on the brink of Armageddon for mocking God in such decisions as are so horribly illustrated in this appeal from the lower courts.

Wherefore, this Court has no alternative but to remove the LIEN from Christian Church; or remand to lawful court for Common Law JuryTrial per pais peers.

XI

CONCLUSION

XI

CONCLUSION

The I.R.S., Appellees, had no jurisdiction/authority to put LIEN upon Christian Church; and refusal to remove the LIEN on those grounds compounded the Criminal actions thereof!

In a Christian Nation, no non-Christian, nor those doing the bidding of satan, can sit with impunity and assumed jurisdiction/authority in judgment of actions taken against the Christian church.

The Nuremberg mandate is quite clear. The U.S.S.Ct. justices stated that no citizen is required to obey an evil law or evil order; in fact, must RESIST such evil. This is the same mandate of Scripture. No Christian is allowed to honor or glorify that which is of satan.

In addition, the denial of mandated and guaranteed Constitutional Right of the Sovereign Citizen are complete loss of alleged jurisdiction/authority...by the various branches of government, as well as the lower courts.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, was denied the right to Jury Trial, a Right which he never surrendered; the numerouls unenumerated, reserved, and inalienable Rights; together with the multiple Constitutional Violations listed above.

Such denials establish a Tyranny; and in violation of the mandate and Guarantee of REPUBLIC.

Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, has, at all times demanded proof that the relevant branches of government involved are legal, lawful, Constitutional. <u>All have failed to prove</u>. Such failure estabishes theLIEN upon Christian Church as FRAUD, Felony, Treason, Anarchy, by various Criminal groups.

The greatest RIGHT to be violated is:
THE RIGHT TO BE LET ALONE.
This, in a republic is THE Prime Right.

An individual in a republic is sovereign majority of ONE; and cannot be compelled to obey the alleged majority of "democracy" without his permission/consent. Force and Coercion to attain compliance is NOT consent.

The fact that it is required to appeal instant case to this court is prima facie evidence that irresponsible, miniature Hitlers dominate the lower courts who have violated and continue to violate the Rights of Appellant.

On that basis, in addition to above, ALL branches of government have lost any alleged jurisdiction/authority of the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity Appellant, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland. For, such violations qualify as Perjury, Felony, Treason, Anarchy, Outlaw; and are not the actions of a responsible, accountable government.

Plaintiff, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, had NEVER agreed to such criminality.

That the word of the Minister being equivalent to that of 2-3, or more, witnesses, all filings by Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland are Affidavit, whether so designated or not. And, as Affidavit, under the provisions of Acts, Matt.18:15-17,etc. all are Theological Judgment; and which remains in effect.

The government is not required to enforce such judgment (Body of Liberties 1641); but is required, by law, to HONOR, and must HONOR. For the lower courts to Dismiss, and to Deny the Guaranteed Constitutional Rights is the most shocking

DISHONOR.

Refusal to docked, in this court, or to hear is further DISHONOR. For, such refusal ADMITS to Theological Judgment, and NOT to the merits of this or the lower courts. Such refusal establishes the government to be Anti-Justice, Anti-Christ.

For, no "civil" action, or inaction, can vacate Theological Judgment. That which is bound on earth is bound in heaven; and cannot be loosed by "civil" frivolities and fol de rol.

Thus, the Instant Case, and all prior briefs, petitions, motions, writs, pleadings (between 500-1000)each being and remain AFFIDAVIT of Minister, regardless of court semantics, is and remains Theological Judgment.

Jesus Christ did not come to this world 2000 yrs ago to win Pupularity Contests. HE came with a MANDATE..and this Court must abide by it, or face the Wrath of GOD at HIS Judgment.

XII

THEOLOGICAL JUDGMENT

Approximately 1636, in Shipboard Covenant, this Nation was dedicated to GOD; and affirmed numerous times since, at the Constitutional Convention, and in the numerous courts and branches of the government.

In 1641, the first written law, the Body of Liberties, established and guaranteed, as the Magna Carta of what was to become the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, FREEMAN, Allodial Freehold, Jury Trial, Due Process, and approximately a hundred, more or less other rights. Many of these found their way into the Constitution of the United States, others remaining as the Common Law.

One of the important changes whs that between government and Church. Where formerly the government was required to enforce through the courts, all theological judgments, the Body of Liberties mandated that the courts were no longer required to enforce...but must HONOR all such judgments.

To dismiss or deny is, of course, Dishonor.

Thus, under the provisions of the Body of Liberties, and the authority of Scripture, Rt.Rev.Dr.Edward Wayland, ordained by GOD, 1/6/36, recipient of Manhattan Project awards, and thus

ualified, herein establishes this as Theological Judgment:

1. Title 26 U.S.C. is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional; and no Christian is bound to observe it.
2. Title 28 U.S.C. is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional; and no Christian is bound to observe it.
3. The I.R.S., together with all alleged "agents" is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional; totally without jurisdiction/authority; and no Christian is bound to obey any of its "orders".
4. Furthermore, the I.R.S. is proven to be of satanic-demonic activity and origin. It is infamous and in infamy is attempting to force upon Christians the Mark-of-the-Beast: Number 666. This 666 is forbidden to all Christians in REVELATION. And is the precursor of evils, Armageddon, Judgment to come in the End Time.

666 is a horror and an abomination to all Christians.

5. The Department of Justice is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional, and has no jurisdiction/authority to act in any capacity in any court. It has ratified, and is accessory to the Mark-of-the-Beast. Thus, is a further horror and abomination.
6. Taurp, and these of the U.S.C.A.1. are illegal, unlawful, unconstitutional; and none of the "orders" issued are thereby valid. As ratifying and accessory to Government-Crimes, and to the Mark-of-the-Beast, all therein are further abomination. 666
7. The LIEN upon Christian Church is FRAUD; false and fraudulent documentation (a crime); and is thus null and void.

That any further denials of Justice and Access-to-Justice are an abomination; and precurser to the Number-of-the-Beast Horrors.

All that is required of the Minister is to Warn-the-Wicked they are in danger of THE Judgment; and to present his witness. Under God's Free Will, the decision made by those warned is personal and immediate. The Minister is NOT required to prove. Only satan demands a myriad of "proofs" which mean nothing, convince nobody, obscures justice, and creates the Legalisms that Jesus Christ cursed so Wrathfully!

GLOSSARY

Article 6: mandates that ALL state and federal uphold the Constitution as the Supreme Law of the Land. Violations, in any capacity are, of course: Perjury, Felony, Treason, Anarchy, Outlaw.

Admit, Admit/Aver: Whatever is admitted, or averred by failure to timely answer or completely deny is TRUE. Such is not for a particular case but for ALL time. For, GOD does not allow anything to be TRUE.....temporarily. It is either TRUE..or it is false.

AFFIDAVIT(and thereby Theological Judgment): It Is Written that the word of the Minister is equal to 2-3, or more, witnesses. This establishes Affidavit; and, as Affidavit, is Theological Judgment.

Amendment 17-Senate(election senators): votes short of required 2/3rds in congress; ratified by 3/4ths states(?), some of which were and are illegal; improperly signed into"law". Thus, since 1914-15, Senate is illegal, unlawful, unConstitutional

Common Law: Founded upon Christian Scripture is divided into Private-Wrong (Civil) in litigation between citizens; and Public-Wrong (Criminal) in all litigation wherein government is one of the litigants..regardless of case-label..at which point all Proceedural Safeguards Apply, including Burden-of-Proof upon government.
Thus, in instant case, Appellant is actually DEFENDANT against oppressive government practices.

Constitution: The government is not the Constitution; the Constitution is not the government. With the Help of GOD, a good Constitution was created for a Christian Nation. It remains a good Christian Constitution...though government has long since departed from its Mandates and guarantees. This nation has a Constitution; but does not have a Constitutional government.

Contract: The Constitution of the U.S. is the contract between the Sovereign Citizen, Master(Third-party non-signer) and the government as Servant. Included are provisions that when the government breaches Contract-Covenant-Faith, the Sovereign Citizen is released from Contract.
A government that is not a Constitutional Government is Breach of Contract.
All violations of Constitutional Guarantees and Mandates are Breach of Contract with the Sovereign Citizen, Breach of Covenant with GOD, and Breach of Faith with BOTH.

Fails-to-Protect: The ONLY legitimate function of government is to protect the Sovereign Citizen; and the only legitimate function of the judiciary is to protect the Sovereign Citizen from oppressive government practices. This is mandated by Amend.4.

FRAUD: In addition to the legal definitions of FRAUD, any and all violations of Constitution, Common Law, Theological Rights by the government is FRAUD, misrepresentation, despotism, and tyranny.

GOD'S LAW OF LIBERTY & JUSTICE: Sometimes called the Common Law, the Law of the Land, the Law of Conscience; and is founded upon Scripture, not upon man-made "law". It is not "case-law"; nor that of the former king's self-serving courts, regardless of names applied.

JUDGES: In donning the robes of office, the person ceases to be a politician and becomes a minister FOR the administration of God's Law of Liberty & Justice. And, in such position, GOD requires much from him. Those who remain politicians are thus betrayers, Judas Iscariots; for GOD has ordered the administration of HIS justice, and HIS Wrath is fearsome.
God has given to man..Free Will.
Does the government presume to be greater than GOD?
Jurisdiction/authority is a grant from the Sovereign Citizen Sovereign Immunity to the government for a specific purpose; and is NOT from government attempt to establish government-grant privilege. Abuses, usurpations, of that jurisdiction/authority are, of course, negation of all.

OATH OF PURGATION: Each Christian has the RIGHT TO PURGE HIMSELF before GOD of all iniquities, unrighteousness, both real and those falsely charged against him. This is acknowledged and affirmed in several federal courts. And, such Purgation can not be challenged..without damnation to the challenger, for such is challenging the forgiveness of GOD. It just isn't done. Together with Purgation, the Christian can then Charge-to-Ordeal his accusers (which has been done, and which has been defaulted). Thereby, the Accusers have admitted to Perjury, Felony, Treason, Anarchy, Outlaw.

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY: Government has established that the Sovereign is immune from suit without express permission/consent.
But who is the Sovereign? The government?
The Preamble, Amendments 9,10, establish that the Citizen, as Master, is Sovereign; and thus is in Sovereign Immunity. The government, as servant, is thus NOT the Sovereign, and cannot claim any immunities. For those belong to the Sovereign Citizen.
Thus: Give unto Caesar that which belongs to Caesar applies only to the Sovereign Citizen; for no servant can be greater than the master; and government is SERVANT.
Thus, violations of the Constitution, also violate the Word of GOD.

THEOLOGICAL JUDGMENT: Jesus Christ passed HIS Commission (Acts of the Apostles) to HIS Disciples and to those who followed. It is farther granted by the provisions that "what is bound on

earth is bound in heaven; and what is loosed on earth is loosed in heaven."

No government can, with impunity, violate or interfere with such judgment.

666

This is the number of the abominable BEAST spoken of in Revelation.

It is the number on Treasury Department(IRS) bagges: 666

Checks accidently released from the Treasury Dept.are: 666

Many passports are now numbered: 666

Laser-beam codes are now numbered: 666

On 1040 forms (several years) were numbered: 666

The Number, and the BEAST are an abomination; and an unpardonable SIN of unrighteousness.

No Christian is allowed without the danger of damnation.

So Sayeth The Lord GOD.

Rt Rev Dr Edward Wayland pastor pro se
forma pauperis
Sovereign Citizen;Preamble.A.9,10
Sovereign Immunity; " " " "

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 1006
LOWELL, MASS. 01853

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that service of the foregoing JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT will be made promptly upon Appellees upon docketing of instant case; and should the U.S.S.Ct. refuse the right to Petition, shall not be served.

Rt Rev Dr Edward Wayland pastor pro se
forma pauperis
Sovereign Citizen;Preamble.A.9,10
Sovereign Immunity; " " " "

RT. REV. EDWARD WAYLAND
P. O. BOX 1006
LOWELL, MASS. 01853

CA# 284 822 500